[31st July 1933

TEMPORARY—*cont.*

(1) *Extension of previous sanctions*—cont.

| Department and designation of the post. | Pay per mensem. | Period of tenure. | Remarks. |
|---|---|---|---|
| | RS. | | |
| Law Department— | | | |
| Assistant Secretary, Law (Drafting) Department. | 500—50—800 | Six months from 30th January 1933. | To assist the Under Secretary, Law (Drafting) Department. |
| Law (General) Department— | | | |
| Additional Sub-Judge, Tanjore. | 650 | From 1st January 1933 to the summer recess of 1933. | |
| (2) *Posts newly created.* | | | |
| Public Works Department— | | | |
| Executive Engineer. | 625—1,375 | Four years from 16th March 1933. | For the execution of the Kistna East Bank Canal Scheme. |
| Public (Special) Department— | | | |
| (1) Collector .. | 2,500 plus £30 overseas pay. | From 26th January 1933 to the end of the Delhi Session of the Assembly. | Mr. A. G. Leach, I.C.S., was appointed to be on special duty as a nominated member of the Assembly. |
| (2) Collector .. | 2,500 plus Rs. 300 overseas pay. | From 31st January 1933 to the end of the Delhi Session of the Assembly. | Mr. P. C. Dutt, I.C.S., was appointed to be on special duty as a nominated member of the Assembly. |

S. A. VENKATARAMAN,
*Deputy Secretary to Government.*

---

## APPENDIX III.

[*Vide* item XII—Papers laid on the Table of the House at page 45 *infra*.]

### G.O. No. 430, Development, dated 4th April 1933.

In pursuance of an undertaking given by the Hon'ble the Law Member in reply to a question asked by Khan Bahadur Yahya Ali Sahib Bahadur at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on the 2nd November 1931, a report was called for from the Collector of Nellore on the working of kancha system of grazing in that district. The Collector, after personal enquiry in as many as thirty-four villages in the Udayagiri, Atmakur and Rapur taluks, submitted a report to Government giving a very fair account of the attitude of the villagers towards the system as distinct from the administrative point of view. The Government have carefully considered the report in consultation with the Chief Conservator of Forests and are pleased to pass the following orders.

31st July 1933]

2. One of the complaints brought forward against the kancha system was that it is more costly to the average cattle-owner in the village than grazing on the permit system. The Government are informed that the rates levied by the kanchadars are slightly higher than those levied by the Forest Department under the permit system. The grazing available in the kanchas is however much better both in quality and quantity than that provided in the forests where the permit system is in vogue and this will more than compensate for the small increase in the fees charged by the kanchadars. If the villagers feel that the kanchadars are making undue exactions, it is open to them to form themselves into a panchayat or a co-operative society and take the lease jointly in their own names. This will prevent kanchadars from exploiting the ryots, and as far as the regular fees are concerned it does not appear that the grievance is a real one.

3. Another complaint brought against the kanchas system is that the kanchadars show preference to foreign cattle-owners at the expense of local cattle-owners. The Government understand that the extent of some of the kanchas is larger than is required for the cattle in the immediate vicinity, and that the kanchadar is apt to admit cattle from elsewhere to make it easier for him to pay the lease amount, which, in the interests of revenue, has to be based on its area. The Chief Conservator of Forests suggests that the difficulty can be overcome by insisting, as a condition of the lease, that permits for foreign cattle should not be issued until the 1st October by which date all local owners would have purchased their permits. He also suggests that Rangers may be explicitly instructed not to issue foreign permits until a week prior to 1st October and after satisfying themselves that permits had been issued to all local cattle. The Government accept the suggestion and direct that it be adopted and its results watched.

4. Another almost universal complaint against the system is that the kanchas are closed to grazing for five months in the year at a period when the cattle can get no grass anywhere else. The closure is from 1st May to the 30th September and is enforced to secure the maximum yield of grass and to ensure its regeneration. The Government are advised that it is not desirable to allow the first flush of tender grass to be grazed and thereby damage its further growth. It is also reported that there are extensive unreserves and zamindari forests to which the villagers can send their cattle when the kanchas are closed. The Forest Department has also opened up some " pentas " (chiefly in the hills behind the kanchas) where grazing and penning are allowed during the period of closure, though these are not easily accessible to villages situated far away in the plains. The Government are not therefore convinced that a strong case has been made out for throwing open the kanchas for grazing throughout the year. As it is, however, represented that the period of closure is longer than is actually necessary for the regeneration of the grass, the Government direct that it be reduced from five to three months (1st July to 30th September).

5. A further complaint made against the system is that, unlike the permit system where the whole division is open to grazing, grazing under the kancha system is restricted to the particular kancha for which a permit is taken. The circumstances of the two cases are, however, distinct. It is well known that the grazing in ordinary divisions covered by permits is frequently of a sparse and scattered character, and that the effective area, i.e., the area in which grazing is adequate, often constitutes only a small part of the total area to which the permit applies. The supply of grass in kanchas, on the other hand, is comparatively ample, and the effective area usually corresponds closely to the nominal area covered by the lease. In the circumstances, the Government do not think there is much force in this objection. The Government do not therefore consider that any hardship is caused by the restriction.

6. It was also represented to the Collector that the tyranny of kanchadars is worse than that of the forest subordinates against which there is always the remedy of appeal to higher authorities, while the kanchadar is irresponsible in his actions. The remedy for this appears to be in the hands of the villagers themselves, who can combine to take the leases and oust the kanchadars. The Government see no reason to alter the system to save the villagers from the consequences of their own negligence or inability to act in unison.

(By order of the Governor in Council)

S. H. Slater,
*Secretary to Government.*

---

## Appendix IV.

[Vide item XII—Papers laid on the table of the House at page 45 supra.]

### Local Self-Government (P.H.) Department.

### COMMUNICATION TO THE COUNCIL.

With reference to the answer given to question No. 753 at the meeting of the Legislative Council held on 23rd March 1933, the following report obtained from the District Medical Officer, Nellore, is laid on the table:—

[Legislative Council question No. 753 answered on 23rd March 1933.]

Kanigiri hospital is a very small hospital with an average attendance of 100 patients per day of whom the average attendance of females is 34. There is not sufficient work even for one sub-assistant surgeon and the appointment of another lady sub-assistant surgeon is superfluous.

S. G. Sengodaiyan,
*Deputy Secretary to Government.*